



**Bill Lueders** <blueders@gmail.com>

Jul 25, 2019, 3:30 PM (7 days ago)



to Rep.Nygren, Cali.Keller, bcc: Christa ▾

Thanks for this response. It appears as though you have decided to do what you can to maximize the cost of these records, contrary to your own stated willingness to reduce it. Let me recount our email exchange:

You said on June 18, with regard to the cost of compliance:

The actual cost could be higher or lower based on actual time spent by staff to fulfill the request. Your request seeks communications over the span of 3 ½ months on the largest bill of the legislative session. Limiting the scope of your request would likely reduce the amount of staff time spent fulfilling the request.

I responded, that same day:

What if it were limited to emails you received that mentioned the word budget? There is a very simple way to do this search. Or can you show me a record that catalogs the input you have received? When someone calls or sends an email, do you create a record of what they contacted you about?

You responded, also that day:

You asked for all communications involving the state budget over a 3 ½ month period. Are you suggesting you are only looking for emails? Again, you asked if your request will result in a cost higher than \$25. As your request stands, it will likely not only be above \$25, but also above \$50, which is the statutory threshold for charging. We will not know the total cost until our staff have completed their search of records. We will proceed with fulfilling the request unless you state otherwise or change the scope or time frame of the request.

I clarified, also on June 18:

Yes, I am suggesting that you just look for emails, which I imagine is the bulk of the contacts. I also suggested, for the sake of making it easier for you, that you just provide any documentation you have created that tabulates the input on the budget that you have received.

To recap: You expressly stated to me that the cost would be lower if I narrowed my request. I agreed to do so, and even suggested that the request could be satisfied by providing a tally of input you received. You then ignored that response and set out to maximize the amount that you could seek in response to my request.

Please be aware that I have on many occasions received records from lawmakers regarding input they received and have never been charged a location fee of any amount. Are you arguing that your office uniquely lacks the competence to identify responsive records without incurring huge costs?

I restate my request for records of your internal tally of input that you received regarding the state budget, from March 1, 2019, to present. Given your [public claim](#) that the Republican budget is a reflection of the input you have received from members of the public, it seems safe to assume you have some easy way of assessing that input that does not require ringing up enormous costs.

Thank you for your time and consideration.